

Article details: 2015-0071	
<b>Title</b>	Attitude to health risk in the Canadian Population: evidence from a nationwide cross-sectional survey
<b>Authors</b>	Nick Bansback PhD, Mark Harrison PhD, Mohsen Sadatsfavi MD PhD, Anne Stiggelbout PhD, David G.T. Whitehurst PhD
<b>Reviewer 1</b>	Dr. Th Lu
Institution	National Cheng Kung University, Department of Public Health, Tainan City, Taiwan
General comments (author response in bold)	<p>This study used a large market research panel to determine the attitude to health risk in the Canadian population and factors associated with heterogeneity in risk attitude. This is a very interested topic. The manuscript is well-written. Followings are some comments for authors.</p> <p>1. Please describe more on the survey done by the market research agency. What is the original purpose of that survey? Is the original purpose consistent with the purpose of this study? What is the sampling frame and sampling design? I even do not know whether the survey was done by telephone or face-to-face interview.</p> <p><b>Response: We thank the reviewer for the positive and constructive comments. We have clarified the original purpose of the study, and cited the papers that the main survey was for. We have also clarified the sampling frame and design in section 2.1, making it clear that it was a web survey.</b></p> <p>2. Can authors spell out specific research questions in the end of the introduction? How did this study solve the problems or weaknesses of previous studies?</p> <p><b>Response: We have revised the background and more clearly stated our objectives. We also clarify that there have been no previous surveys of the health risk attitude of Canadians. Accordingly, we are not comparing our results with previous Canadian studies.</b></p> <p>3. Some of the background information in the material &amp; method section could be moved to introduction section, such as the selection of scales.</p> <p><b>Response: In response to Editorial comments, we have reformatted the paper with only two background paragraphs. Based on all reviewers' comments, we have carefully thought about how to best present the necessary information. We trust our amendments meet with your approval.</b></p>
<b>Reviewer 2</b>	Dr. Roy Dobson
Institution	College of Pharmacy and Nutrition, University of Saskatchewan
General comments	<p>Although very well written I did not conclude that the study has done anything to extend knowledge in this area. Perhaps it is simply a matter of presenting the findings in a manner that more effectively communicates the significance of the findings. As a result I am recommending a major revision to address this fundamental concern.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Clear and concise. No concerns</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>The authors do a good job explaining how the study was carried out and the rationale used to answer the research questions. Similar to the Introduction, the section was well written and concise</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>No real issues with results as presented. Presentation of the findings was clear and tables and figures appropriate and well displayed.</p> <p>In the discussion the authors explain the implications of their finding for various stakeholders within healthcare and this is very helpful</p>